UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/791;572	03/03/2004	Yu-Fang Hu	26197/169122	3102
38598 ANDREWS KI	7590 07/31/200 URTH LLP		EXAMINER	
1350 I STREET, N.W.			ROGERS, JUNE MARIE	
SUITE 1100 WASHINGTO	N, DC 20005	·	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•	•	1609	
	·		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
		•	07/31/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summan	10/791,572	HU ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Juné M. Rogers	1609			
The MAILING DATE of this communica Period for Reply	tion appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence ac	ddress		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAII - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statuto - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ING DATE OF THIS COMMU 7 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may action. ry period will apply and will expire SIX (6) N by statute, cause the application to become	NICATION. The a reply be timely filed CONTHS from the mailing date of this control (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed of	nn				
	This action is non-final.				
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for		atters, prosecution as to the	e merits is		
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the app	lication.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) 1-17 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the E	xaminer.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	accepted or b) objected	o by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by	the Examiner. Note the attach	ed Office Action or form PT	ΓΟ-152.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for a) All b) Some * c) None of:	foreign priority under 35 U.S.C	. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
 Certified copies of the priority do 	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.				
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
Copies of the certified copies of t		en received in this National	Stage		
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).				
* See the attached detailed Office action for	or a list of the certified copies no	ot received.			
Attachment(s)					
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO- 	4) Interview	v Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date			
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	f Informal Patent Application				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:					

Restriction

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-10, drawn a composition comprising arsenic trioxide, classified in class 514, and subclass 504.

II. Claims 11-17, drawn to a method treating cancer, classified in class 424, subclass 400.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions II and I are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the product, can be used to as a radiation sensitizer in radiation therapy.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search for Group I is not required for Group II. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. It is noted that while the searches for Group II and I may be overlapping, there is no reason to believe that the searchers would be co-extensive. In searching Group I, the Examiner will be focusing on the patentability of the product itself, and not he process of

using of Group I. Conversely, in searching Group II, the Examiner will be focusing n the patentability of the process and not the product itself. Accordingly, a search for both groups would pose an undue burden on the Office.

Rejoinder Notice

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further,

note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Election

The following specie election is required whether applicant elects the invention of Group I or Group II.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

- 1. Various cancers, enumerated in claims 2,3,12,13,
- 2. Various polymers, enumerated in claim 8.

The species are independent or distinct because as disclosed the different species have mutually exclusive characteristics for each identified species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Specifically, applicant is required to select (1) a type of cancer (i.e. breast cancer) and (2) a polymer.

Applicant is cautioned that the election of specific species that is not disclosed, as filed, may be considered new matter.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search

(e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete <u>must</u> include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the

evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

Inventorship Notice

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Conclusion

Due to the complicated nature of the restriction, the restriction requirement is being made via written correspondence in lieu of a telephone interview.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Juné M. Rogers whose telephone number is 571-270-3497. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T 8:00-5:00 EST.

Application/Control Number: 10/791,572 Page 7

Art Unit: 1609

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin H. Marschel can be reached on 571-272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ARDIN H. MARSCHEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER